



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

man who introduced into Rome, in pure form, the poetry of Greece. They were right, for to Ennius preeminently all departments of Roman poetry, save comedy, were deeply indebted. He made his influence profoundly felt in the *satura*, in tragedy, and in the epic, and through his introduction of the hexameter affected again indirectly the drama and the *satura*. The meter and the prosody of Livius Andronicus, Naevius, and Plautus passed away, but the hexameter and the prosody it conditioned endured to the end of Latin literature, at least to the end of the higher forms of Latin literature. Lucian Mueller<sup>6</sup> holds that, without Ennius, Horace and Vergil would be unthinkable, and he declares that, had there not been some such reformer as Ennius, the tendency to disintegration which made itself so strongly felt in the Latin language with the decline of culture in the third century A.D., to end in the rise of the Romance languages, would have made itself felt before the close of the Republic. The ever-increasing power of the Romans, accompanied as it was by the ever-widening use of their language<sup>7</sup>, exposed their language to peculiar dangers; against these Ennius safeguarded it for centuries by his introduction of the hexameter and of the rigid rules necessary for the successful production of hexameter verses. Ennius showed that it was possible to imitate in Latin the meter of the Greeks in its pure, not in its distorted, forms, and that, if its variety, its versatility could not be attained in Latin, it was possible at least to reproduce its strength, its logical consistency and its symmetry.

By doing all this for Latin poetry, Ennius necessarily laid Latin prose also under deep obligations to himself. After he had enriched the Latin language and had dignified poetry, it was natural that higher demands should be made also on prose. He may be said, therefore, to have made possible the movement which resulted in the prose periods of Cicero and Livy.

From a second point of view, then, we have made plain the importance of the metrical form. No one can lay claim to an understanding of the rise and development of Latin literature, whether in prose or verse, who has not paid considerable attention to metrical matters.

C. K.

(To be continued)

### PRIMITIVE WOODEN STATUES WHICH PAUSANIAS SAW IN GREECE<sup>1</sup>

My preface is a true apologue. A friend of mine, unacquainted with Greek, neither ethnologist, nor anthropologist, nor *religiologist*, a person not a student at all, in the more narrow, technical sense of the word,

but ingenuously sensitive to literary appeal, and, be it added to this long characterisation, adamant in refusal to read anything conceived or discovered to be uninteresting, once declared Frazer's translation of Pausanias to be one of the most fascinating books in English. Of this the moral is obvious: we *mystae* of the Classics err in passing to the students in our class-rooms, as well as to our uninitiated, our profane, friends, the stock description of Pausanias as an ancient Baedeker.

He certainly was a most entertaining traveller, not at all the man of absolute, adequate information, but one who went about gleaning facts here and there, naively recording the steps by which he gained his knowledge of this detail and that, and, quite as frankly, setting down a memorial of his scepticisms, inferences, and perplexities. Of course, if he were the dullest of all authors, his testimony would be peculiarly valuable, as that of a well-educated Greek belonging to the second century of our era who, writing of the important cantons of the Greek mainland, must needs give a view of Hellenism from a standpoint similar to ours, after the greatness was accomplished and extinct, while, unlike us, he had by tradition and inheritance the clue to various ideas, puzzling to us, which underlie Greek art and religion, indeed, that whole civilization. Therefore he must be a remarkable medium between ancient Hellenism and modern students thereof.

It is a pity that his work is not more familiar to the general reader of Greek. It seems to me that, barring that pleasant experience which comes to most lovers of the Classics who visit Greece, that thrill in listening to some bit from this old traveller read on the very spot described, he has been appropriated by three sets of enthusiasts—students of topography, students of ancient ritual, and students in search of clinching arguments, whether to sustain or to demolish a theory concerning anything under the sun that bears on antiquity. It is striking that, apart from random grudging respect, when his evidence has been required for the date of some artist or some piece of plastic work, those who make a specialty of the study of Greek art are not generally very friendly to him. They cannot forgive his rather vexatious preference for odd archaic things to masterpieces. And yet I suspect that in his pages, by reason of that pertinacious desire of his to probe for shreds of intelligence about early monuments, there is much to be learned concerning the beginnings of Greek art.

Of sculpture in wood, for example, he has much to say. Here his advantage over us is immense, for he actually saw many wooden images, reverend objects. Scattered through the ten books of Pausanias, there are at least sixty unmistakable records of wooden

<sup>6</sup>In his *Quintus Ennius, Eine Einleitung in das Studium der Römischen Poesie* (St. Petersburg, 1884), an excellent book. See especially pages 1-8.

<sup>7</sup>Here one may read with profit, in Professor F. F. Abbott's book, *The Common People of Ancient Rome* (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1911), the chapters entitled *How Latin Became the language of the World* (3-31) and *The Latin of the Common People* (32-78).

<sup>1</sup>This paper was read at the Tenth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at the Central High School, Philadelphia, April 14, 1916.—For a paper on Pausanias, viewed from a different angle, see the article, *Pausanias as an Historian*, by H. L. Ebeling, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 7:138-141, 146-150.

images which were in Greece in his time. I have found, on gathering the list, that these always represented deities, the roll itself being interesting and rather quaint in detail: Eileithyia, Artemis, Nemesis, Pan, Dionysus, Apollo, Athena, Heracles, the Dioscuri, Tyche, Asclepius, Hygeia, Coronis, Aphrodite, the Mother of the Gods, Hermes, Orpheus, Kore, the Charites, Ge, Demeter, the Muses, Trophonius, Britomartis, Zeus, Ares, Hecate, Damia and Auxesia, Hera, Thetis, Enyalios, Nike. There are strange absences here, as also strange presences.

An even more attractive list of dedicators may be drawn up, for in this particular Pausanias seems to take pleasure in swinging us back to the grand heroic days. Thus we hear of Phaedra's dedicating to Eileithyia at Athens two wooden images of the goddess, wrapped in drapery—apparently actual garments of stuff—from head to foot, an unusual custom, except at Athens<sup>2</sup>. At Athens also there was a dedication of Cecrops, a wooden Hermes on the Acropolis, which, when Pausanias saw it, was almost hidden by myrtle boughs<sup>3</sup>. Hypermetra is named as the dedicator of an Aphrodite Nikephoros at Argos, her offering having been occasioned by gratitude for the goddess's aid in acquitting her at the trial for the sin of breaking her vow out of loving kindness to her husband<sup>4</sup>. In the same passage we read of a wooden Hermes by Epeus, the famous artificer of the Wooden Horse. Near this same city, Argos, in a temple on the road to Mantinea, Pausanias saw statues which Polynices and his Argives set up to Ares and Aphrodite<sup>5</sup>. Also in the Argolid, on the slope of Mt. Pontinus, just above the Lernean marshes and the sea, in a temple founded by Danaus there was a seated image of Dionysus Saotes<sup>6</sup>. With regret, Pausanias tells that Tiryns had once had a wooden statue, also a dedication of Danaus, that of Lycian Apollo, but that in his day this had been replaced by one of later workmanship<sup>7</sup>. In a remote town in Laconia, Pyrrhichus, he saw wooden images of Artemis Astrateia and Apollo Amazonius, which the warrior women from Thermodon had placed there to mark a point where their invading army had halted<sup>8</sup>. In Sparta there was the famous Artemis Orthia, a little statue of wood, which perplexed our voyager and led him to much explanation, because there were various conflicting tales; some asserted that this was the original Tauric idol stolen by Iphigenia and Orestes from the barbarous land where she had served the cruel goddess and that it had been at Brauron and later at Athens, others maintained, that the original had been carried away from Attica by the Persians and that Seleucus had given it to the people of Mesoa, who for certain ritual purposes had to share it with the inhabitants of Patrae<sup>9</sup>. Pelops is named as the dedicator of a statue on the banks of the river Hermus in Elis, in the city Temnos, an image of Aphrodite made

of myrtle-wood, which Pelops with shrewd sense set up when he prayed to win the hand of Hippodamia<sup>10</sup>. Thebes had several fine old memorials of this kind. One of these was the work and also the dedication of Daedalus, the most noted of all makers of wooden images, who this time was commemorating his gratitude to Heracles for recognising the body of Icarus, when the sea tossed it up on the beach of the island of Samos, and burying it<sup>11</sup>. The tale, by the way, that Pausanias has to tell about the son's mishap does not mention wings, but records that Daedalus and Icarus were speeding away from the wrath of Minos in a little boat fitted with sails, a new invention at that time, and that Icarus knocked himself overboard by his awkward management of the rudder. There were three wooden images of Aphrodite at Thebes which Harmonia, the wife of Cadmus, had dedicated, calling them by cult-epithets to designate three aspects of the deity's influence, Urania, Pandemos, Apostrophia<sup>12</sup>. Two other heroines are named in connection with statues of this technique—Procne, who set up at Daulis a likeness of Athena which she had brought from Athens<sup>13</sup>, and Ariadne, who carried from her father's house, when she fled with Theseus, an image of Aphrodite, wrought by Daedalus<sup>14</sup>. Fickle Theseus took it along with him on sailing away from Naxos, but, while he was at Delos, he decided that it would be the part of prudence to dedicate it there to Apollo, lest, if he were to take it to Athens or Troezen, it should remind him unpleasantly of the deserted girl and create complications of the heart.

It is not only in regard to the dedication of these images that Pausanias has engaging stories to narrate. Among the romantic legends connected with the provenience of some of them, he says that one was miraculously discovered in a cave by a band of Greek heroes on their way home from Troy and thence reverently carried to Hellas<sup>15</sup>, that another, a strange statue, representing the One-eyed Zeus Herkeios, that had been among Priam's ancestral possessions, was a part of the spoils of the great victory<sup>16</sup>, that still another, a statue of Apollo, which barbarians had sacrilegiously thrown down from its base on the island of Delos, was conveyed unharmed by the waves to Cape Malea, where the people of the countryside, obedient to the Delphic oracle, revered it highly, counting it a prime treasure<sup>17</sup>. In another instance, similar to the last, some fishermen caught in their nets a fragment of a wooden image, merely the face<sup>18</sup>. This was at Methymna, a place outside Pausanias's travels, but he knew the tale, as he indicates, through the explanation which the exegete at Delphi gave of a bronze statue of Apollo Phallen in the precinct, a work sent by the Methymnaeans as a copy *in extenso* of their fragmentary god. The wooden countenance was said to be kept at Methymna as something very holy.

<sup>2</sup>1.18.5. Compare 7.23.6. <sup>3</sup>1.27.1. <sup>4</sup>2.19.6.  
<sup>5</sup>2.25.1. <sup>6</sup>2.37.2. <sup>7</sup>2.19.3. <sup>8</sup>3.25.3.  
<sup>9</sup>3.16.7-11; 1.33.1; 7.20.8; 8.46.2-3.

<sup>10</sup>5.13.7. <sup>11</sup>9.11.4-5. <sup>12</sup>9.16.3-4. <sup>13</sup>10.4.9. <sup>14</sup>9.40.3-4.  
<sup>15</sup>2.23.1. <sup>16</sup>2.24.3. <sup>17</sup>3.23.2-4. <sup>18</sup>10.19.3.

It was usual, it would appear, to regard the ancient wooden images with the greatest veneration, the rites associated with them sometimes being intimately bound to very old local legends and customs, sometimes being mystic. Thus Pausanias marks as peculiar the ritual belonging to several cult-images of wood: to that of Kore at Helos, near Amyclae, and of Orpheus in this same neighborhood, on Mt. Taygetus<sup>19</sup>; of Artemis Eurynome at Phigaleia, the mermaid-goddess, bound in golden fetters, whose very ancient shrine was opened only once a year, and of whose image Pausanias honestly records that, since he was so unfortunate as to miss the great day, he knew its appearance merely by hearsay<sup>20</sup>; of Ge Eurysternos in a shrine near Crathis in Achaea, an image which appeared to him to be one of the oldest wooden statues in Greece<sup>21</sup>, dedicated to a goddess whose priestess, if accused of breaking her religious vow, must be tested by drinking a cup of bull's blood; of Damia and Auxesia at Aegina, deities almost identical with the Eleusinian Twain<sup>22</sup>; of Thetis at Sparta, whose rites, in obedience to a miraculous vision of a certain Lacedaemonian lady, were taught by captive Messenian women<sup>23</sup>. It is noteworthy that it was through a dream that Onatas of Aegina, commissioned to make a bronze copy of the Horse-Headed mystic Demeter at Phigaleia, whose ancient wooden image had, some time before his day, been destroyed by fire, gained all information regarding the details of the statue<sup>24</sup>. The oldest shrine of Aphrodite on Greek soil, that of Urania at Cythera, had a wooden cult-statue, representing the goddess armed<sup>25</sup>, and there was a wooden statue in another venerable temple of this deity, that of Aphrodite Areia at Sparta. Whether here too the goddess was armed, Pausanias does not say, but he designates the sanctuary as 'ancient, if anything is ancient in Greece'<sup>26</sup>. Sparta possessed three more wooden images of the Sea-Born, one with the epithet Hera, to whom mothers sacrificed when their daughters were married<sup>27</sup>, the other two standing under the same temple roof, but in different chambers<sup>28</sup>. The structure of this temple was unique among the buildings that Pausanias saw in Greece. There were two stories, with a cult-chamber on each level, and in each a wooden image of Aphrodite. That in the lower cella was of the armed type, without epithet, that in the upper was surnamed Morpho and was odd in that the statue was chained. The legend of the shrine had it that Tyndareus had fettered her to punish her for the reproaches incurred through her by his daughters. 'But', Pausanias exclaims, in one of his rationalising moments, 'it were certainly silly to make a carved thing of cedar and give it the name Aphrodite and hope thus to get even with the goddess!' One recalls the fetters on Eurynome at Phigaleia and wonders what, after all, they symbolised. Pausanias records the practice in

another place in connection with a wooden image of Enyalios at Sparta, declaring that the idea of the Lacedaemonians in chaining this god was the same as that of the Athenians in depriving Nike of wings, that the deity should not desert them<sup>29</sup>. Of course, this simple symbolism may be exactly that in which men of primitive times would have indulged, but I confess that the explanation does not satisfy me. Could the implied suggestion be that here was an immortal who had been captured by a mortal? The application to the mermaid Eurynome does not seem far amiss, when one remembers the tale of Menelaus and the seals and, better still, that of Peleus and Thetis.

The fact, indubitably plain in Pausanias's account, that wooden images were almost always closely associated with the most sacred and venerable legends of the countryside to which each belonged, I have stressed in the hope of showing that they were expressions of Hellenic religious thought. In other words, the impression that I have received in studying the evidence is that, whatever the source of the technique was, the statues carved in wood were executed after Greek ideas for Greek people. But, without question, there had been much artistic influence from outside. Pausanias clearly acknowledges this, pointing to Egypt as the parent of the style. In one passage<sup>30</sup> he says: 'I am confident that in the days of Danaus all statues were of wood, and that they were particularly the Egyptian kind'. In another<sup>31</sup> he names two broadly distinct types of workmanship, the Egyptian and the Aeginetan, and it is instructive to observe that in a third context he shows that Callon of Aegina, a famous early artist, some of whose work was done in wood, was the pupil of two earlier sculptors, well known as pupils of the Cretan School<sup>32</sup>. The palm of excellence for wood technique he gives to Crete, notably to Daedalus<sup>33</sup>. I am inclined to believe that there came to primitive Greece from Egypt two currents of technical tradition regarding sculpture in wood, one indirectly by way of the Aegean, or Minoan and Mycenaean, civilisation which preceded the Hellenes—of which the extant remains amply demonstrate a debt to Egypt—the other directly, through the Greek colonies in northern Africa. Possibly it would be right to construe the fact that, although Pausanias has a canon of woods that were used for wooden images 'of yore'<sup>34</sup>, a rather outlandish list—ebony, cypress, cedar, (oak), yew, lotus, and, in one instance some kind of aromatic wood called *θύος*, perhaps eucalyptus—, he has several scattered references to more homely Greek woods: willow<sup>35</sup>, myrtle<sup>36</sup>, olive<sup>37</sup>, (oak<sup>38</sup>), pine<sup>39</sup>. The discrepancy may, however, indicate merely the tendency of the Greeks to adapt a foreign custom to their own resources. That is, Minoan Crete as a

<sup>19</sup>3.20.5-7.<sup>20</sup>3.14.4.<sup>21</sup>3.13.8-9.<sup>22</sup>8.41.5-6.<sup>23</sup>8.42.3-13.<sup>24</sup>3.15.10-11.<sup>25</sup>7.25.13.<sup>26</sup>3.23.1.<sup>27</sup>2.30.4; 2.32.2.<sup>28</sup>3.17.5.<sup>29</sup>3.15.7.<sup>30</sup>2.19.3.<sup>31</sup>1.42.5.<sup>32</sup>2.32.5-6.<sup>33</sup>8.53.8;<sup>34</sup>5.13.7.<sup>35</sup>9.2.7-3, 9.

9.11.4-5;

<sup>36</sup>2.30.4;<sup>37</sup>10.19.3.

9.40.3-4.

<sup>38</sup>8.17.2.<sup>39</sup>3.14.7.<sup>39</sup>2.7-3, 9. This wood belongs to the 'canon'. <sup>32</sup>2.2.7.

medium for interpreting Egyptian ideas may, in this specific art, have been of comparatively little importance. I can well imagine that a Greek in those days when Hellenic sculpture was very primitive, if he had been privileged to peer at a lifelike wooden statue in an Egyptian tomb or temple, as we may look through the slit at the image set up in the cult-chamber of the tomb of Perneb, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, would, granted that he was 'wise of hand', step away, determined to try his luck at this marvelous technique. Little by little, the secrets of the craft, and also certain Egyptian conventions of treatment, would have found their way to the Greek motherland. Yet I suspect that, years before there were Greek settlements in Africa, stimulus to plastic effort had reached the rude Hellenic cities of the mainland from the overthrown kingdom of Minos.

It is not at all my belief that the whole story of the rise of Greek sculpture is revealed by tracing these trains of early influence. Nor, in the matter of using wood as a plastic material, do I deny that the Greeks were affected by the religious idea manifested in the worship of trees. Indeed, among Pausanias's passages on images of wood, there are three which offer good support for this theory of 'Baumcultus'. The first<sup>40</sup> narrates that, with the Thunderbolt whereby Semele was consumed, there had fallen into her chamber a piece of wood, which Polydorus later ornamented or overlaid with bronze and called Cadmus. The second<sup>41</sup>, more unmistakable in import, describes the feast of the Daidala at Plataea, an occasion when images, carved from the trunks of trees designated by omen, were burned in honour of Hera Nymphaeomene. The implication is that the idols, *daidala*, as they were called, were in some way symbols of the goddess herself. The third<sup>42</sup>, regarding two wooden statues of Dionysus which stood among the sacred memorials in the market-place at Corinth, affords the best example of all. The story went that the Pythian priestess had instructed the Corinthians to seek among the forests of Mt. Cithaeron the very pine-tree whence Pentheus had spied at the Bacchic *thiasos* of the women of Thebes and to honor it as if it were the god<sup>43</sup>. Therefore from its wood they had wrought these statues and surnamed them *Lysios* and *Baccheios*. I think that the cult of trees had a part in promoting the growth of Greek sculpture, much as the worship of pillars contributed to the same end, but I am not of the opinion that in the seventh and sixth centuries, when plastic types were being formulated, these religious ideas prevailed. I hold rather—and here the testimony afforded by vase-painting is of the greatest value, establishing as it does the fact that, through the action of various foreign influences at different times on a crude, but vigorous, native style, this art was carried to the excellence termed Hellenic—that the observation, in early times, of foreign technique in sculpture,

infinitely superior to anything of which unaided Greek workmen had conceived, was probably the greatest of all the motive forces that swayed them. It seems to me reasonable to suppose that they chose first to copy wooden statues, for the exceedingly hard substances out of which Egyptian sculptors carved their more durable work must have filled those primitive Greek carvers with dismay. Because these emulators of the finished technique which they had seen, whether among Egyptians or Minoans, were Greek, and therefore economical, original and ingenious, they soon began to experiment with various materials—bronze, gold, silver, porous stone, common limestone, and the marble in which their land was rich. There was a technique, generally regarded as something peculiarly Hellenic and associated with thought of the great masters of Greek sculpture, that is, the chryselephantine, which seems to stand in close relation to work in wood. I have wondered whether the custom, sometimes practised by early sculptors of wooden statues, as Pausanias shows<sup>44</sup>, of gilding large portions of the image and fashioning the head, hands, and feet of stone, gave rise in later times to the idea of combining ivory and gold, or whether there were pre-Hellenic chryselephantine statues which were rudely imitated by the gilded acrolithic figures.—In the time of fully developed Greek art the grand works in gold and ivory were certainly responsible for the orders which poor states gave for colossal images of marble and gilded wood.—To the query concerning the relation in primitive times between chryselephantine technique and plastic work in wood, I have no answer, beyond the 'feeling'—a woman's reply—that the beautiful prehistoric figurine from Crete, now in the Boston Museum, the image in ivory of a woman encircled by snakes, which are represented by hoops of gold, indicates that chryselephantine statues were known among Aegean peoples centuries before there were Hellenes.

And so we touch at Crete again. I like the symbolism contained in the tradition that Daedalus, that shadowy ancient artisan, whose very name denotes his trade, was a Greek who had sojourned for a long time at the court of Minos<sup>45</sup>. After all, the primitive wooden statues which Pausanias saw, while they might clearly display their debt to a foreign country in details of technical treatment and even of artistic conception, were essentially Greek in spirit. They portrayed, apparently with as much truth to nature as the artist could manage to express, Hellenic gods and goddesses. There seems to have been no strict type according to which all were supposed to be fashioned, for Pausanias shows that among them there was much variety in matter of pose, drapery, cult-attributes, and individual accessories. In the course of his remarks on one of these images which belonged to Corinth, a nude Heracles, one of the many wooden

<sup>40</sup>9.12.4.<sup>41</sup>9.2.7-3.9.<sup>42</sup>2.2.6-7.<sup>43</sup>3.2.12-13.<sup>44</sup>6.25.3; 7.8.22.7; 9.4.1.<sup>45</sup>8.53.8.<sup>46</sup>2.4.5.

statues which tradition assigned to the hand of Daedalus, he has a comment which might serve as a delightful characterisation of archaic Greek sculpture as a whole<sup>46</sup>: 'Whatever works Daedalus executed are rather absurd to look at, but there is, nevertheless, in them something divine'.

HUNTER COLLEGE,  
New York City.

FLORENCE M. BENNETT.

### REVIEWS

The Greek Tradition: Essays in the Reconstruction of Ancient Thought. By J. A. K. Thomson. London: George Allen and Unwin Co., Ltd., New York: The Macmillan Co. (1915). Pp. xiii + 248. \$1.50.

Here is a collection of essays, on a variety of subjects, which will offer many fruitful suggestions to the American teacher. Not that the author, who is already known from his *Studies in the Odyssey*, exhibits any startling originality, or has any revolutionary theory to defend; but all the chapters of the book seize the reader by a certain clearness of vision and a humane spirit in dealing with the Greek and the Latin authors he has read, and are written with a fine taste and with bits of sentiment and genuine feeling, particularly in the paraphrase of the story of Demeter and Persephone, which characterize the best English interpretations of the Classics to-day.

The opening chapter, *On an Old Map*, is a delightful and instructive series of remarks suggested by the *Orbis Terrarum ad Mentem Herodoti*, dealing with the earliest use of a *περίοδος γῆς* by Herodotus and his predecessors, and leading to interesting speculations, confessedly based on Victor Bérard, concerning the voyages of the Phoenicians, the thalassocracy of Minos before them, the trade routes of the Mediterranean, Delphi and the Hyperboreans, and the method of Herodotus in general. Mr. Thompson's conclusion that Herodotus, in his conception of geography, is "agnostic and critical", and the insistence on the ironical element in his work, present a refreshing contrast to the attitude of mind which dismisses the Father of History as hopelessly credulous and gullible.

The thoughtful study of Thucydides, in the second chapter, protests against the over-worked modern attempt to find an economic factor at work in every historical phenomenon. While many will feel that the statement, "No aspect of the genius of Athens was unfelt by Thucydides", is something of an exaggeration (Mahaffy should be read again as a corrective), the author is right in denying that Thucydides is cold and unemotional. He says,

My whole assent goes with those whose interpretation of Thucydides' mind begins with the conviction that he shared to the full the passion of love and service to Athens, and that his book is the record of a shattered dream.

The chapter on Greek country life has much that appeals to the present day. After a vivid picture of

the Greek landscape and mode of life in the country, the author illustrates again with many examples the intimacy of the Greeks with nature. Modern city life, for all the study of the sciences that our children are supposed to pursue in the Schools, produces a vast ignorance about the common phenomena of nature; and it is my belief that there is no better way to correct this ignorance than by studying the Classics. Greek literature, for example, makes no mistakes about the phases of the moon. It offers no such curiosity of ignorance as *Jane Eyre* does when she looks out of the window at dawn to see the crescent moon rising in the east. The cry *Back to the country* might well be reinforced by *Back to the Greek*.

Other stimulating chapters deal with *Alcestis* and her hero, *Mother and Daughter* (the *Demeter* myth), *Greek Simplicity*, *Lucretius*, *Some Thoughts on Translation*—every teacher should read this—and the *Springs of Poetry*. There is a brief *Introduction*, by Gilbert Murray.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

C. B. GULICK.

Aristophanes: *Clouds*. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Lewis Leaming Forman. New York: The American Book Company (1915). Pp. 352. \$1.50.

This edition of the *Clouds* contains an Introduction, (77 pages), the Greek text and commentary (140 pages), and an Appendix (120 pages). The Introduction, which deals with Aristophanes, the poet and the man, with contemporary Athens and its intellectual movements, and with comedy, is concluded with a discussion of the rhythms of the *Clouds*. The commentary deals directly with the understanding of the text and is not overweighted with illustrative matter. The Appendix consists of a second set of notes containing a wealth of material in confirmation or illustration of briefer statements in the Introduction and the commentary.

The editor remarks in the Preface that the first thing for the student is to read the play as a play, undistracted by collateral information. The text and the accompanying commentary are, then, the heart of the book. There is on each page a reasonable amount of text and a due amount of comment. The comment has quality, too. Aside from being competent in all points of scholarship, it does justice to Aristophanes by its vivacity. I refer not merely to the apt way in which grammatical or antiquarian knowledge is stated, but to a very unusual degree of skill and resourcefulness in dealing with puns, parodies, diminutives, and all the array of verbal surprises characteristic of Old Comedy. Dr. Forman gets fun even out of the proper names, and makes his mother tongue bend and turn with something of the skill of Aristophanes. The contribution of a large number of neat verbal turns is a decided merit of this edition